**Letters received from MPs**

1874. SHRI VIREN J. SHAH:
SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN:

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of letters addressed to the Minister and the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development by the Members of Parliament during each month of 1994 and so far in 1995;

(b) in how many cases the letters were acknowledged on their receipt and in how many cases final replies were sent to the MPs concerned;

(c) in how many cases neither the letters have been acknowledged nor any final reply has been sent to the MPs concerned and what are the reasons therefor in each case; and

(d) what are the details and the present position of such letters and by when a reply is likely to be sent to MPs concerned?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI P. K. THUNGON): (a) to (d) The information is being collected and will be laid on the table of the House.

**Stay orders on unauthorised occupations by VIPs**

1875. SHRI VIREN J. SHAH:
SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN:

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 251 given in the Rajya Sabha on 23rd December, 1994 regarding unauthorised occupation of Government accommodation by VIPs and state:

(a) the present position of each such case and what steps Government have taken in getting the stay vacated;

(b) what are the details of the cases in which the accommodation under unauthorised occupation in the General Pool and the outstanding dues have been regularised during each of the last three years;

(c) what is the composition of the competent authority and what are the details of each case in which it has relaxed the existing rules during each of the last three years; and

(d) what are the details of the rules made under the Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 authorising the competent authority to make such relaxation?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI P. K. THUNGON): (a) Out of 9 cases of unauthorised occupation referred to Rajya Sabha Starred Qn. No. 251 on 23rd December, 1994 two unauthorised occupants have since vacated the accommodation and the present position of these 9 cases is given in the Statement-I (*See* below).

(b) and (c) Unauthorised occupation and outstanding dues in respect of general pool accommodation are regularised with the approval of sub-Committee of Cabinet known as Cabinet Committee on Accommodation. The details in which the outstanding dues in respect of unauthorised occupation of general pool accommodation have been regularised during the last 3 years are given in the Statement-II (*See* below).

(d) The Public Premises (Eviction of Unauthorised Occupants) Act, 1971 is meant for vacation of public premises from unauthorised occupants. It does not provide any relaxation by the competent authority to regularise the unauthorised occupation and outstanding dues.

**Statement-I**

*Present position of each such cases of unauthorised occupation*

| S. No. | Name of person | House No. | Remarks |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Family of Late Shri Darbara Singh, Ex-MP | 9, Krishna Menon Marg | Eviction order passed. Request for alternative accommodation on security grounds under consideration/examination. |
| 2. | Family of late Shri Bhagey Goverdhan, Ex-MP | 19, Dr. B. D. Marg | Vacated on 23-1-1995 |
| 3. | Sh. M.M. Jacob, Ex-MP | 4, Kushak Road | Request for retention/allotment of alternative accommodation is under consideration/examination. |
| 4. | Pt. Ravi Shankar, Ex-MP | 95, Lodi Estate | Request for retention of accommodation under Artists Quota is under consideration/examination. |
| 5. | Sh. M.C. Bhandare | 3, Moti Lal Nehru Marg | Eviction order passed, Stay from Court. |
| 6. | Sh. M. Padmanabhan | 7, Raisina Road | Eviction order passed. |
| 7. | Sh. Kamal Morarka | 12, Teen Murti Lane | Eviction order passed. |
| 8. | Sh. J.K. Jain | AB-10, Dr. Z.H. Marg | Vacated on 5-1-95 |
| 9. | Sh. M.M. Ali Khan | 103—105, North Avenue | Request for retention under consideration/examination. |

**Statement-II**

*Details of the cases in which the outstanding dues in respect of unauthorised occupation of General Pool accomodation regularised during the last three years*

| S. No. | Name of S/Shri | Remarks |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Justice R.S. Pathak | Period of overstay at 5 K.M. Marg. from 18-7-89 to 17-9-89 was regularised by charging Spl. licence fee @Rs. 7,564/- p.m. instead of Damages. |
| 2. | S.P. Shukla, ex-Secy. | Allowed retention of AB-86, Shahjahan Road for the period 1-7-92 to 31-8-92 on payment of double the flat rate of licence fee. |
| 3. | J.P. Singh, ex-MS (R.M.L. Hospital) | Allowed retention of 51, Lodhi Estate from 1-2-89 to 26-10-89 on payment of twice the flat rate instead of damages. |
| 4. | R.C. Vikal, ex-M.P. | Allowed retention of 5, Dupleix Lane from 2-5-90 to 6-7-90 on payment of special licence fee. |
| 5. | H.K.L. Bhagat, ex-M.P. | 1. Allowed retention of 34, Prithvi Raj Road for two years from 20-6-91 on payment of normal rate of licence fee. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| | | 2. Allowed further retention for three years from 20-6-93 on payment of spl. rate of licence fee. |
| 6. | Nawal Kishore Sharma, ex-M.P. | Allowed retention of 3, K.M. Marg from 27-12-89 to 2-1-90 on payment of Spl. licence fee instead of damages. |
| 7. | R.L. Pardeep, former Jt. Secretary | Allowed retention of CI/10, Pandara Park from 16-9-90 to 19-7-91 on payment of double the normal rate instead of damages. |
| 8. | Late Sh. C.P.N. Singh, ex-M.P. | Decided to charge the family of Late Shri C.P.N. Singh for the period of overstay in 2, Akbar Road from 26-1-90 to 19-3-90 on payment of normal licence fee instead of damages. |
| 9. | S. Mukhopadhyay, former Prime Collector Customs. | Decided to charge double the normal licence fee for the period of overstay in flat No. D-8-1, (MS) R.K. Puram from 29-2-92 to 31 5--92. |
| 10. | Late Sh. G.S. Dhillon, ex-M.P. | Decided to charge normal licence fee instead of damages for the period ofoverstay in Bungalow No. 3, Tyagaraj Marg from the family of Late Shri Dhillon. |
| 11 | Smt. Ramdulari Sinha ex—M.P. | Decided to charge normal licence fee for a period of one year in respect of bungalow No. AB-96. Shahjahan Road from 14-3-88 and at twice the rate from 14-3-89 to 26-12-89. |
| 12 | Justice M.K. Chawla . . | Decided to charge normal licence fee in respect of 18, Ashoka Road from 5-2-91 to 30-10-91 instead of damages. |
| 13 | Late Sh. Mohd. Amin Ansari, ex—M.P. | Decided to charge normal licence fee for the period of overstay from 14-9-90 to 22-9-91 in Bungalow No. 18, G.R.G. Road instead of damages. |
| 14 | Lok Pati Tripathi . . . | Decided to charge rent at double the normal licence fee instead of damages for the period of overstay from 7-11-90 to 14-10-91 in respect of bungalow No. 9, Janpath. |
| 15 | Late Justice R.C. Patnaik | Decided to waive the rent payable for the period of overstay in respect of bungalow No. 15, Tughlak Road. |
| 16 | B.S. Ramoowalia, ex—M.P. | Decided to charge licence fee under FR 45-B, with DC instead of damages for the period of overstay from 27-12-89 to 10-5-90 in respect of bungalow No. 15, Ferozshah Road. |
| 17 | Kaushal Kumar | Allowed to retain flat No. CI/35, Pandara Park from 7-9-89 to 4-11-89 on payment of twice the licence fee instead of damages. |
| 18 | Smt. Thankamma Stephen, ex-Member, Minorities Commn. | Decided to charge double the licence fee instead of damages for the period of overstay in flat No. C1/32, Pandara Park from 30-9-90 to 20-12-90. |
| 19 | R.K. Saiyed ex-Secy. | Decided to charge double the normal rate for the period of overstay in CII/24, Tilak Lane from 1-10-90 to 5-11-91 instead of damages. |
| 20 | Ms. Saroj Khaparde, M.P. | Decided to reduce the hire charges of furniture to be recovered to Rs. 10,000/- only instead of Rs. 62,669/- claimed in respect of 98-100, South Avenue. |

| 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
| 21 | N.K. Puri | Decided to waive the penal rent for the period from 1-1-92 to 18-2-92 in respect of 10-B, Rajaji Marg and charged double the normal licence fee. |
| 22 | K. Kipgen | Decided to charge normal licence fee instead of damages for the period from 1-3-87 to 24-6-88 in respect of flat No. CI/18, Pandara Park. |
| 23 | A.R. Bandopadyay | Decided to charge twice the normal licence fee from 1-12-93 o 31-12-93 in respec. of flat No. DI/200, Chanakya Puri instead of damages. |
| 24 | Dinesh Singh | Decided to charge twice the normal licence fee i.e. Rs. 1950/-p.m. for the period 20-6-91 to 16-1-93 in respect of bungalow No. 1, Thyagaraj marg instead of damages. |
| 25 | Sudarshan Agarwal | Allowed retention of AB-9, Pandara Road upto 30-6-94 on payment of twice the licence fee instead of damages. |
| 26 | Smt. R.K. Bajpai, ex—M.P. | Allowed retention of 6, Ashoka Road upto 11-11-92 on payment of flat rate of licence fee instead of damages. |
| 27 | Vasant Sathe | Regularised the period of stay in bungalow No. 2, Krishna menon marg from 20-6-91 to 4-2-93 on payment of normal licence fee instead of damages. |
| 28 | Late Sh. Z.R. Ansari | Decided to waive the entire amount of Rs. 97,766/- due in respect of bungalow No. 9, Akbar Road. |
| 29 | Smt. Mohisina Kidwai | Decided to waive the entire amount of Rs. 51,303/-due in respect of bungalow No. 12, Janpath. |
| 30 | Smt. Krishna Sahi | Decided to charge normal licence fee instead of licence fee under FR, 45 with DC in respect of bungalow No. 7, Teen Murti Marg from 2-1-90 to 28-3-90. |

**Sub-standard construction material used in Mayur Vihar flats**

1876. SHRI VIREN J. SHAH:
SHRI PRAMOD MAHAJAN:

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether Delhi Development Authority has decided to raze 265 Flats in Mayur Vihar, Phase-I which were found to have been built of sub-standard construction material;

(b) if so, what are the details of DDA flats found defective or of sub-standard construction in other areas/ colonies in Delhi during each of the last three years;

(c) when were these flats constructed and at what cost; and what are the names of the contractors responsible for the construction of these flats;

(d) whether any enquiry has been conducted into the matter; if so, the results of the enquiry and action taken against the contractors and DDA officials found responsible;

(e) the steps taken to recover the cost of construction together with the penalty from persons responsible for the use of sub-standard material;

(f) the cost of each of these flats, when were the payments made to Delhi Development Authority by the allottees of these flats;

(g) whether DDA propose to make alternative allotment to the allottees on the same rate, if not, what are the reasons therefor; and